1	IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT			
2	FOR THE DISTRICT OF OREGON			
3				
4	ANGELA TORRES,)		
5	Plaintif	ff,) No. 3:17-cv-1270-AC		
6	vs.) February 2, 2018		
7	ALIREZA ZAMANIZADEH, a/k/a AZZAMANI, an individual, and	LI) Portland, Oregon		
8	ADULT CARE SEARCH, a foreign non-profit corporation,)		
9	Defendant)		
10	Detendant	5 .		
11				
12				
13	TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS			
14	(Preliminary Injunction Hearing)			
15				
16	BEFORE THE HONORABLE MICHAEL H. SIMON			
17	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT JUDGE			
18				
19				
20				
21				
22				
23		an White, RMR, CRR, CSR/CCR ted States District Courthouse		
24	1000 SW 3rd Avenue, Room 301 Portland, Oregon 97204			
25		03) 326-8184		

1		APPEARANCES	
2			
3	For the Plaintiff:	PDX LAW GROUP	
4		By: DAVID RICHARDSON david@pdxlawgroup.com 621 SW Morrison Street,	Suite 1200
5		Portland, Oregon 97205 (503) 546-0141	Suite 1200
6			
7			
8			
9			
11			
12			
13			
14			
15			
16			
17			
18			
19 20			
21			
23 24			
25			
11			

1 (February 2, 2018; 3:02 p.m.) 2 3 PROCEEDINGS 4 5 THE COURT: Good afternoon. 6 Please be seated. Relax. 7 THE CLERK: Your Honor, this is the time set for a preliminary injunction hearing in civil case 17-1270-AC, Torres 8 9 versus Zamanizadeh, et al. 10 And can I have counsel and defendant in court please 11 identify yourself for the record beginning with plaintiff. 12 MR. RICHARDSON: David Richardson on behalf of plaintiff, Your Honor. 13 THE COURT: Good afternoon, Mr. Richardson. 14 15 MR. ZAMANIZADEH: Ali Zamani, Your Honor. THE COURT: And good afternoon, Mr. -- is it --16 17 MR. ZAMANIZADEH: Zamani is fine, Your Honor. 18 THE COURT: Zamani? 19 MR. ZAMANIZADEH: Yes. Zamani is fine. 20 THE COURT: Thank you, sir. 21 MR. ZAMANIZADEH: Either/or. Whichever is more easier 22 for you. 23 THE COURT: Thank you, sir. And welcome. 24 afternoon. 25 I do understand that you did have -- the defendant did

have an attorney, that the attorney -- you are welcome to be seated, relax -- that the attorney filed a motion to withdraw and that Judge Acosta granted that motion.

I understand that that was fairly recent, so you may not have had very much time yet to locate a new attorney to represent you. And so I will -- whatever we do today, I will be certainly glad to reconsider if you have a new attorney coming to assist you.

But right now we are here because a few weeks ago, I believe it was on January 10th, I entered a temporary restraining order, and part of that order also included an order to show cause why I shouldn't issue a preliminary injunction.

I note that nothing formal has been -- nothing has been filed in opposition to a preliminary injunction. My guess is that's largely because of the transition from your attorney to now you being unrepresented.

And so if both sides want to tell me at all about where things stand in the current dispute, I'll be glad to listen to you, and then I've got some suggestions about how we proceed from here.

Mr. Richardson, since you represent the plaintiff, why don't you begin by telling me from your perspective or your client's perspective where things stand now, and then I'll hear from the defendant.

Keep in mind, both of you, it is not my role to assist

in a settlement here, so do not disclose to me any offers or counteroffers on settlement. I mainly want to know where are we in the litigation and in the request for preliminary injunction.

Mr. Richardson?

2.1

MR. RICHARDSON: Would you prefer me to stand, Your Honor, or remain seated?

THE COURT: Your preference.

MR. RICHARDSON: I'll remain seated. Thank you.

THE COURT: I'm going to remain seated. So you do what you want.

MR. RICHARDSON: Okay. Your Honor, there's been no progress since two weeks ago, and I honestly feel that it was a bait and switch tactic, and I felt like there were representations that were made that were not accurate.

I do have a supplemental declaration with exhibits, but I worry that there's going to be settlement in there. But we could go potentially back in chambers. But I do have a declaration prepared.

I'm not sure if it's relevant. I'm not sure that whether or not a settlement on good faith on either side was entered into matters regarding the standards of whether a preliminary injunction should be entered.

I mention it, though, just, for one, I think that Mr. Zamani will probably bring it up as well, but more importantly, I feel that there has been opportunity for a

response to be filed. It's true that Mr. Calderbank filed his motion to withdraw, but that was after our hearing in front of Your Honor, and they had two weeks prior to that to file a response.

And I feel -- my concern is it would be prejudice to my client that if we push this out a month or longer, that -- and new counsel is retained, that now they get a second bite at the apple, they have another opportunity to file a response.

So even -- I guess I would be okay extending the temporary restraining order if that's something you are going to recommend to us. But I would ask that the record be frozen where it is, and I think that would be fair.

I'm going to put to both of you, and I'll hear both views, and I'll turn to Mr. Zamanizadeh in a few moments, is that I don't think I can extend a temporary restraining order since under the rules it can only last for 28 days absent agreement of the parties. But what I can do is enter a preliminary injunction. I do think that there's enough information in the record to support a preliminary injunction.

But that said, I would want to give the defendant an opportunity to have relief from that if and when he gets an attorney or wants to, on his own, file a motion to have it dissolved.

So my tentative thinking, but I'd like to hear from both of you, is to enter a preliminary injunction on the same terms as the temporary restraining order, however, it would then be without prejudice to the defendant and he would have leave to move to lift the preliminary injunction order either if he gets an attorney and wants to file that motion, or if he decides to represent himself and chooses to file a motion to lift or amend or dissolve the preliminary injunction. I will let him do that and I'll listen to it on the merits.

At the same time, I will also listen to you,

Mr. Richardson, as to whether there's any undue or unfair

prejudice to your client.

Now is not the time for me to decide to freeze the record or anything like that. But if there's some argument and some evidence that comes in later to try to dissolve the preliminary injunction, you can let me know if there's any undue or unfair prejudice to your client and I'll consider that.

But I think that there's not likely to be prejudice if today I enter a preliminary injunction because, even if it was opposed right now, I would enter a preliminary injunction -- if I entered a preliminary injunction and then something happened in the future where the defendant, either himself or through an attorney, asks me to dissolve it or to modify it, I'd listen, and then we would deal with that on the merits.

So I'll ask you first, Mr. Richardson, on behalf of

plaintiff, any objection to that approach? 1 2 MR. RICHARDSON: No objection, Your Honor. sounds like a reasonable compromise. 3 4 THE COURT: Okay. Mr. Zaman- --5 MR. ZAMANIZADEH: Your Honor, just Zamani is fine. Zamani is fine. 6 7 THE COURT: Zamani. Mr. Zamani. Excuse me. So first of all, if you have any preliminary comments 8 9 in response to what Mr. Richardson had to say, you're certainly 10 welcome to say them and I'll listen to you. 11 But also I'd like to hear your view on my proposal 12 that I enter a preliminary injunction right now on the same 13 terms as my previous temporary restraining order, and that will be without prejudice, you will have full leave either if you, 14 15 representing yourself, want to file a motion to have me amend it or dissolve it or modify it in any way, or if you get an 16 attorney and your attorney wants me to modify it or amend it or 17 even dissolve it, and I will certainly listen to you, I will 18 19 listen to both sides, and make appropriate rulings at that time. 20 So Mr. Zamani? 21 MR. ZAMANIZADEH: Your Honor, may I stand or --22 THE COURT: Whatever you wish. 23 MR. ZAMANIZADEH: Your Honor, I appreciate the 24 Court -- time of the Court. And if I may explain and give a

little bit of short background on this before the preliminary

25

2.1

injunction is issued, I would very much appreciate that.

Your Honor, the whole case of the complaint and the TRO is based on a rejected lover to the point that the plaintiff was forcefully and intended to have a relationship with me and I rejected it. She had done all the donation or issues of the complaint on her own, mailed to the company without my knowledge. She had continued the relationship while I was even -- travel several times to my country for transferring my assets from there to here.

As being a US citizen and dual citizenship with Iran, the Iranian government last year, actually in 2016, issued an order that Iranians that hold two citizenships, specifically for United States, that they have two options; one, they have to relinquish one of the citizenships; the other, they have approximately about 24 months to transfer all their assets or the government will take over.

Because of this matter was based on the relationship, as I said, with the plaintiff, she offered power of attorneys to me, offered her assets in order to obtain a loan based on when I was traveling to Iran, when I was in Iran, she was going to have divorce. She had contacted me, stated that she wanted to make a donation to my company and hide her assets for her divorce. I had rejected it because it was against the law and against the Court's rule.

However, I did indicate that if she does make a

donation, she then is able to obtain the tax-deductible credit that we can offer.

She had gone -- without my knowledge, without my presence, she had made the donation, mailed to my office, Your Honor, power of attorney, and then she -- when she was in Salina, California, she made additional donation to our company and there was no problem, there was no issue, there was no demand, Your Honor. I never received a demand letter from the attorney or the plaintiff for returning her assets. However, I offered if she returned the receipts to us, we can go ahead and proceed with what -- we can settle with each other.

Upon my -- when I was in Iran, Your Honor, I asked -- I asked my family, even -- the Iranian government are very, very dangerous. I'm sure you have heard in the news that people go from United States and get arrested there because of different reasons.

I had -- we have substantial properties, family properties, that my -- my own property in Iran that I have sold and ready to transfer. However, when I was in Iran, when I leave Iran, I asked the family and especially the plaintiff, do not e-mail me, do not ask me -- do not contact me for personal matter. You're 10,000 miles away. However -- what I'm doing in Iran or how am I feeling or how the government is treating me has no merit, do not talk to me, because they were constantly watching us, basically following us and listening to the phones

and so forth. She continued sending all her requests for me assisting her suggesting what she should do in her divorce while she had an attorney.

This caused the problem for me in Iran. The problem was that the government of Iran considered me as a spy of United States.

And I want to -- there is some information that I'm going to give to this Court, Your Honor. I would like to have those things sealed. These are --

THE COURT: I'd rather not have any sealed information right now.

MR. ZAMANIZADEH: Okay.

THE COURT: So don't tell me anything that would need to be sealed.

MR. ZAMANIZADEH: All right. And so as a result of that, I was incarcerated. However, the Iranian government has this game that they play. They know how much asset you have, you are US citizen, you come over, and they either try to incarcerate you or try to find a reason to seize your asset and then they sell back to you this -- okay, pay us this amount and you can get your asset or you can leave the country.

However, I did -- they had frozen my assets and they had my passport. I had to put all the assets -- and they requested approximately \$680,000 bond for me to leave. I didn't have the money. And so they kept the property as a collateral,

2.1

gave me the passport, enough for me to leave the country, to get prepared and provide them with the money.

I came back over here, explained that to the plaintiff, that your communication obviously has caused me a lot of problem; however, it's not your responsibility, it's my responsibility. But I do need to come up with the money in order to go back to that country.

Within the time of the donation, original donation,

Your Honor, which was in approximately beginning of the

June 2016, through February, I had travelled approximately twice

to Iran. Had I had any intention to harm the plaintiff, I

didn't have to come back.

And when I came back over here, Your Honor -- and plaintiff herself, she did not even inform her own attorney that after my arrival on December 21st of 2016, she issued a second power of attorney to me because her divorce was final and that she had received properties that are free and clear, she's waiting for \$700,000 to be transferred to her retirement account and the money has not been transferred, and she offered me to use one of the properties to obtain loan in order to be able to take care of my problem, and then when my assets are unfrozen and transferred over here, to get paid back.

When I rejected her in the relationship, Your Honor, without any knowledge to me -- I told her that I was leaving on or about February to Iran to take care of the matter. She asked

me to delay my departure. When I delayed my departure, I immediately got served by a complaint. No demand letter was issued by an attorney.

And I came back. I have been waiting, going through this process. Meanwhile, immediately right after the complaint, plaintiff and her attorney, Mr. Richardson, contacted the Department of Justice stating that we have defrauded her for what receipts — that our non-profit organization was not true and created complaint in the Department of Justice which caused a letter from the Department of Justice, inquiry to provide a specific amount of documentation that I have all that here.

In July 2017, Your Honor, with the meeting that I had with my attorney from Tonkon Torp, we provided every documentation to the Department of Justice.

Up to this day, Your Honor, no citation has been issued, no injunction has been issued, no violation has been issued. Basically nothing.

I then -- when I obtained a loan on the property based on the power of attorney that the plaintiff had provided me, it was a six-month interest only -- I paid all the payments.

Despite of the fact of the TRO filing by the plaintiff that it states that no payment was paid and so forth, I have copies of the checks, Your Honor, here.

I informed my attorney to send a settlement offer and also informed the plaintiff that I am willing to pay back

everything, transfer all the assets that she had donated to the company and provided me as a loan to her upon my return and bringing in the assets.

She also provided me, Your Honor, on 2016 the information about her own personal bank account, and she offered me, said this is my personal bank account at Wells Fargo, this is my password, user name, and information, and if you need any money, go ahead and take it. I never touched anything.

All right. Then, we provided a settlement offer, immediately on January 8th. I was contacted by my attorney to meet -- to discuss the settlement and so forth. He stated to me that Mr. Richardson and the plaintiff have contacted the FBI against me for possibility of flight.

Your Honor, I've been in this country since 1976, for over 40 years. All my family which I have -- there is no other family back home. My father, my mother, my sister, and my brother, they are all US citizens here. I have elderly parents that are in their 90s with Alzheimer's and dementia. We take care of them. Me and my sister take care of them.

So providing the fictitious lies in order to obtain TRO is only for malicious behavior to tie my hands up.

The balance of the account that plaintiff and her attorney are demanding in the complaint in excess of -- including the property is in excess of, say, 560- or \$590,000 of which some of it are real estate. Nobody has

touched anything, nobody has sold anything, nobody has done anything. And having that to be said, connects back, getting a restraining order to tie my personal hand not to be able to pay my attorneys, not to be able to pay representation.

And right after the last hearing that we had in front of Your Honor, we asked the TRO hearing to be postponed to today for possible settlement. The settlement agreement and the settlement time was set the minute we left the court. We agreed that on next Wednesday we meet at Mr. Richardson's office in order to discuss that.

However, when on Tuesday I was asking for my attorney what time do we have to be there, he stated that Mr. Richardson has sent this totally unprofessional vulgar language about me that they don't want to meet and so forth and so forth.

Your Honor, I believe in the court we have two sides. We both have to have the ability to represent or get represented to provide the facts and let the judge to decide not by showing up in the court, not informing my attorney that he is intending to show up in the court and get a temporary restraining order and then create -- providing also some fictitious lies to obtain this temporary restraining order.

The total asset, Your Honor, that it is in the company's account, it's approximately about \$40,000.

THE COURT: Is that for all three accounts? Because

```
the accounts that I'm aware of, there's -- and I'll just use the
 1
 2
    last four numbers -- there's the 6923 account of the Adult Care
    Search, an Oregon nonprofit.
 3
 4
              MR. ZAMANIZADEH: Correct.
 5
              THE COURT: There's the 2074 account, and then 3236
    account, and those are both for acareoption.com.
 6
 7
              Now, $40,000 for all three accounts?
 8
              MR. ZAMANIZADEH: Your Honor, the 2074, I believe
 9
    that's it, that has been closed. Because when I was in Iran, I
    just tried to -- in 2016 to check the balance for the payment,
10
11
    and when I came back, the Bank of Chase closed it due to the
    violation of the --
12
13
              THE COURT: Okay. Was there any money in it when it
14
    was closed?
15
              MR. ZAMANIZADEH: No, there was no money in it.
              And then the 69, I believe --
16
              THE COURT: 6923.
17
              MR. ZAMANIZADEH: 6923 is the Adult Care Search which
18
19
    is a nonprofit organization. I have the bank statement, Your
20
    Honor.
21
              THE COURT: Just tell me --
22
              MR. ZAMANIZADEH: $29,000, and in the Care Option is
23
    approximately $5,000.
24
              THE COURT: Okay.
25
              MR. ZAMANIZADEH: And so I had left those things for
```

the company's operation while I'm gone to do my business and come back and take care of the matter.

However, Mr. Richardson denied the meeting for the restraining order, demanding, okay, pay us all the \$590,000, do this, do this, in order for me to sit down -- you're a crook and you're a con artist.

And so right at the -- on Wednesday, that was where we were supposed to meet, and the meeting did not take place, my attorney calls me and says I'm going to withdraw. And we went in front of Judge Acosta. Judge Acosta allowed the withdrawal and sealed his declaration.

THE COURT: And I've not seen it.

MR. ZAMANIZADEH: Yes.

And I simply ask the judge -- Your Honor, this TRO is totally causing harm to me not to be able to provide or obtain attorney. Every attorney that I've met, Your Honor, in Portland, approximately about ten different law firms --

THE COURT: Although if there's only about, what, \$35,000 in there, how is that interfering with your ability to obtain an attorney?

MR. ZAMANIZADEH: Your Honor, I have no -- I have no funds.

THE COURT: Okay. Those are the only -- how are you living?

MR. ZAMANIZADEH: Well, I am basically using my own

company --

THE COURT: I don't understand. So if all you have -- see, all we're talking about, as far as I understand it, in the Chase bank accounts, we're talking about three things.

The Chase bank accounts that you tell me have approximately \$35,000 -- Mr. Richardson, do you agree with that or do you have any information one way or the other?

MR. RICHARDSON: Just that he showed me the bank accounts outside weeks ago and said the rest of the money has been transferred to Iran which was -- the first thing -- sorry. I shouldn't go further.

THE COURT: I'm just -- I can't freeze that.

MR. RICHARDSON: Right. But that's what made me think that maybe we need to settle because I don't -- there's no money left.

THE COURT: Okay. Well, from the Chase bank accounts, right now I'm accepting Mr. Zamanizadeh's word that -- and it is documented --

MR. ZAMANIZADEH: Yes.

THE COURT: -- that there's about \$35,000 in there.

Then we also -- as part of my temporary restraining order, I've said he may not sell, transfer, pledge, encumber, or otherwise dispose of two pieces of real property, one on Chestnut Street in Washougal, Washington, and one on Telima Lane in Bend, Oregon.

Now, those, as I understand it, were Ms. Torres' 1 2 properties; right? 3 MR. ZAMANIZADEH: Correct. THE COURT: So you can't and probably shouldn't do 4 5 anything with those properties anyway. MR. ZAMANIZADEH: Don't intend to at all. 6 7 THE COURT: So --8 MR. ZAMANIZADEH: I want -- yeah. 9 THE COURT: So it sounds like what the dispute is 10 about is what should happen with those two pieces of real 11 property and what should happen to Chase bank for right now. 12 There may be a bigger dispute for trial. But if you're telling me that my freezing of \$35,000 13 in bank account assets is interfering with you obtaining a 14 15 lawyer because that's all the money you have, that leads me to ask, then, how are you living? 17 MR. ZAMANIZADEH: Your Honor, I have initially 18 established a company, Adult Care, in 2007 for the purpose of a similar triad that the State of Oregon has a problem in 19 20 investigators for long-term care facilities and a lot of problem within the long-term care facilities. This was launched in 2007 22 and it was all over the news and immediately we went all 23 national. 24 And what has happened is, based on the attorney general information that I have provided Your Honor, I

personally have funded the company throughout today. And when the company has funding, yes, I -- based on preliminary agreement, based on loan agreement, based on every documentation that we have provided to the attorney general, yes, I did withdraw some funds in order to make the living, my loans that I've paid which I -- at zero interest.

And I'm just waiting to go back to transfer all my assets. I don't want to go to that country. I have no interest in that country except that every time I go in there, I'm thinking about I'm going to get either incarcerated or shot or be called a spy.

THE COURT: I understand.

MR. ZAMANIZADEH: And so this, I have no interest in the properties, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Okay.

MR. ZAMANIZADEH: I am willing to transfer and provided that in the settlement offer to Mr. Richardson and the plaintiff that I'm -- I have no problem of immediately relinquish and transfer those back to the plaintiff.

And the funds, I have no problem repaying those things. It takes time for me to transfer funds.

Without being able to do my job in order to show my good cause, I cannot be called --

THE COURT: I understand.

Let me ask Mr. Richardson the following question, and

I'm not really talking settlement so much as I'm trying to understand the preliminary injunction issue, whether I should issue that and on what terms.

Would it be acceptable to the plaintiff, just for preliminary injunction purposes, the case would then have to be set for trial? Because, as Mr. Zamani says, there's two sides to every story, now is not the time for the finder of fact, which may be a jury, to decide the actual causes of action that are alleged in this case.

But in terms of the preliminary injunction issue, would the plaintiffs be satisfied of me dissolving the preliminary injunction as soon as Mr. Zamani transfers back to the plaintiff title to the real property?

 $$\operatorname{MR.}$ RICHARDSON: Absolutely not, Your Honor, and I'll explain why.

For one, I think that the scope of the TRO goes further. It's not just -- I mean you specifically name those accounts need to be frozen.

THE COURT: Those are the ones that you asked for in the TRO?

MR. RICHARDSON: Correct. But we also asked for other things in the TRO as well, and those things are actually in the order, specifically that each defendant is restrained from spending, transferring, encumbering, or otherwise disposing of funds originating or transfer- --

```
Hold on. When you read that guickly --
 1
               THE COURT:
 2
                                I'm sorry, Your Honor.
              MR. RICHARDSON:
 3
               THE COURT: -- we're not going to have a clean record.
 4
    So start again and tell me which paragraph in the order you're
 5
    referring to.
              MR. RICHARDSON:
                                I apologize, Your Honor.
 6
 7
                           It's okay.
               THE COURT:
              MR. RICHARDSON: I was listening for a while and
 8
 9
    getting my --
10
               THE COURT:
                          Okay.
11
              MR. RICHARDSON: -- dander up.
12
               So I apologize. It's on page --
13
               THE COURT: Dander down.
14
              MR. RICHARDSON: Yeah. Page 14 of your order.
15
               THE COURT: Right.
                                   Which paragraph?
16
              MR. RICHARDSON: Paragraph 1.
17
               THE COURT:
                           Okay.
18
                               And basically I think paragraph 1
              MR. RICHARDSON:
    indicates that all of the defendants are restrained from
19
20
    spending, transferring, encumbering, or otherwise disposing of
    funds or assets originating from plaintiff or traceable to
22
    plaintiff.
23
               And it goes on to include the real properties, but
24
    obviously that's a lot broader than just freezing the three
25
    Chase accounts.
```

And the reason I think this is important is the oral testimony that was just given. The declaration of the Department of Justice employee Frank Nohar indicates that Mr. Zamani received in total 591,000 from my client. He just testified there's only 35,000 left. Where did it go? Well, we don't know yet.

And it may be that he elects to continue doing and spending that money despite the fact that a permanent injunction is in place. But at least then we would have further cause of action later for him violating the injunction.

We don't know at this point where the remaining \$565,000 is. He has made oral representations to me first before the hearing that he transferred 300,000 to Iran. After the hearing when I called him out on it, he said, no, it's actually 500. I don't know where it is.

But I think that we need the broad language in this permanent injunction to protect us. Because it goes further that -- I think paragraph 5, he may not access any funds, accounts or assets. That power of attorney is still floating around out there. And so I think that we would much prefer to keep it in place.

You agreed on your original temporary restraining order that we had met our burdens and that the -- that we are likely to succeed on the merits. The burden then shifted to the defendant to show why you should not enter a preliminary

injunction. I don't believe the oral testimony today, when weighed against the declaration given by the Department of Justice, is sufficient to achieve that burden.

I would specifically address you to the declaration of Frank Nohar. And there's a lot of good stuff in here, but in particular, paragraph 22, which is on page 5, he says that, "In addition, the bank -- the documents," by that he means the bank records, "show hundreds of transactions from these three accounts during the review period that appear to be for personal expenses. These transactions included payment for domestic and international airlines, restaurants, hotels, bars, nightclubs, adult entertainment venues, department stores, jewelers, and supermarkets. Funds from these accounts were also used to purchase at least four automobiles, gasoline station purchases, and automotive maintenance."

He goes further in paragraph 23. I'll just read you the first sentence.

Actually, I'll read the entire thing into the record if that's okay.

THE COURT: You don't need to. It's in the record.

MR. RICHARDSON: Okay. But basically paragraph 23 says there's no documentation that any of the money was used for charitable purposes, nor is there any information that shows any charitable functions ever happened.

THE COURT: I recall.

2.1

MR. RICHARDSON: So my point being, if we release the \$35,000, we know what's going to happen. He's going to spend it.

To answer your question to him, why does he need it, well, because he needs it to live on, he needs it not for charitable purposes. And I'm confident that if the temporary restraining order is lifted or if the permanent injunction is not entered, he will spend that money in posthaste.

THE COURT: Well, and since this money was donated to a charitable organization, it shouldn't be used, anyway, to pay for the attorney -- your attorney, Mr. Zamani.

MR. ZAMANIZADEH: Your Honor, according to the document that I provided, I believe that is the measure -- the investigator declaration was made biased to the point that the company didn't start in 2016, didn't end in 2017. The company started in 2007, 2012 added the nonprofit organization. I have loaned to the company, and just like any other company or nonprofits, the directors have the employment agreement.

If the company -- I have been putting money in the company, and if I have to take any money -- yes, there was mistaken accounting and so forth, and that has been corrected since then. We have provided all the tax -- all the banking, all the accounting correction, and everything that has been taken has been counted as the payment on a zero interest loan that I have given to the company with documentation to the

attorney general office.

However, I believe based on the biased intent of the attorney, Mr. Richardson, and the plaintiff, a specific question has been asked in this measure, he put in there what he had seen, however, he had not stated that where did the other funds come in from the beginning.

THE COURT: I understand.

Let me ask you, Mr. Richardson. I didn't bring the whole file with me right now. Could you refresh my memory as to the causes of action that are alleged in the complaint? Not the facts, just the -- basically the names or the causes of action, the descriptions.

MR. RICHARDSON: And, Your Honor, I apologize. I'm going to have to go off memory. I don't think I have my complaint.

THE COURT: Mary, do you have your computer up?

MR. ZAMANIZADEH: Your Honor, are you asking for the complaint, the original complaint?

THE COURT: Complaint. Yes.

MR. ZAMANIZADEH: I believe I have one.

THE COURT: Mary, could you borrow Mr. Zamani's complaint? I'll give it right back to you.

MR. ZAMANIZADEH: Original complaint.

MR. RICHARDSON: I think it's fraud and unjust enrichment. But without it in front of me, I hate to --

2.1

THE COURT: That's fine. Let me just double check.

Mary, you can give it back.

Yeah. It's fraud and unjust enrichment, which carry jury trial rights.

And I do think that Mr. Zamani is right when he says that there's two sides to a story and he deserves a right to be heard. And so what I think we need to do is figure out when to get you two to a trial.

Now, if Mr. Zamani wants to have a lawyer hired, then I'll need to set a trial after I speak with your lawyer, make sure it's an appropriate date for your lawyer. If you want to represent yourself at the trial, you have a legal right to do that. It's not a good idea for anybody.

MR. ZAMANIZADEH: Your Honor, I'm not an attorney and I do not intend to do that. And on top of that, there's a company involved, and I cannot represent the company.

And I have found attorneys. However, I have to be able to pay the retainer.

Mr. Calderbank, I asked for the retainer I provided.

And if I may just interject this one. The complaint was filed,

Your Honor, in February. I retained Mr. Calderbank and his law

firm on or about just about two weeks after that. It took him

eight months to file an answer.

Same thing with this Mr. Richardson indicated that when the TRO was filed we had two weeks, he has not done

anything. When we came to your original hearing here, he just had the documentation to file where we were -- we proposed to have a settlement.

It's not that we have deviated -- Your Honor, the fact of Mr. Richardson making this that, hey, you know, you're stealing money from my clients, the fact should be decided in court and in front of a jury.

THE COURT: I agree.

MR. ZAMANIZADEH: I have -- but tying my hands,

Your Honor, not to be able to retain an attorney, not to be able
to fight and basically provide all my facts to defend against
the allegation that plaintiff has brought in, FBI issues and
Department of Justice, basically is sandbagging this whole case
by tying my hand in order to win and then say, okay, well, you
know, we won it.

THE COURT: Well, the only hands that I'm tying are hands that would basically be trying to spend money that originate from the plaintiff or are traceable to the plaintiff.

If you've got money that does not originate from Ms. Torres or it's not traceable back to her, my order doesn't interfere with that at all. If you have other money coming in from your business, I'm not -- or other businesses, I'm not interfering with that.

But I think what -- not I think. Here's what we're going to do. I'm going to enter the preliminary injunction now,

but I will allow you, through your attorney, whenever you want, you may ask me to modify it, to lift it, to dissolve it. All you have to do, then, is present to me good legal arguments and a factual basis and I will consider that.

MR. ZAMANIZADEH: Your Honor --

THE COURT: One moment.

In addition, I don't intend to let this case drag on for a long period of time. That probably will hurt both sides.

So as soon as you get an attorney, have your attorney contact Mr. Richardson and my courtroom deputy -- or,
Mr. Richardson, if the attorney contacts you, tell the attorney that I would like you to contact my courtroom deputy, we'll get on the telephone together and we'll set a trial date.

This is not that complicated of a dispute. Mr. Zamani is right. There's two sides to every story. He is entitled to his day in court. We're going to get a jury in here and we're going to resolve the dispute with a jury trial.

To the extent that my order does place a little bit of pressure on Mr. Zamani with respect to the funds, so be it.

I'm sorry, sir, but I think it's the fair result given the only thing I'm really tying you up on is funds that originate from or are traceable to Ms. Torres. Until we decide whether she's entitled to those monies or your nonprofits are, we're going to preserve them.

MR. ZAMANIZADEH: Your Honor, if I may ask, with all

respect to the Court, if I can just have my Care Option account which has nothing to do with the adult care, has a minimal amount, so it can allow me to spend for my attorney's retainer, that would be sufficient for me.

THE COURT: How much do you need for your attorney's retainer?

MR. ZAMANIZADEH: Your Honor, every attorney that I've met, they want 5,000 retainer to even discuss this. I have found an attorney and they are waiting right now to -- for me to go and give them a call and say what is -- are they able to get -- even Mr. Calderbank, when I asked him to refund the retainer, he goes he cannot do it because it's -- it might be under the TRO.

THE COURT: All right. Well, I will add to the TRO the following: That since your attorney has withdrawn and since that money has already been sent to him anyway, I think it's not inappropriate to say that any retainer that should be refunded may be refunded not subject to the TRO or preliminary injunction. That way you can then use that retainer for a new attorney.

Mr. Richardson, if you want to object to that, you may, but that's pretty much the way I'm likely to go. That money is already gone anyway.

MR. RICHARDSON: Your Honor, I would object to it for one good cause for you to consider.

I have spoken with an attorney of Mr. Zamani's from years ago not related at all to this case, and I think that attorney is owed a bunch of money as well, and he indicated that just to be careful, that Zamani is sophisticated and he knows one way to hide money is to put it into a trust account.

So I would just ask that there be maybe a dollar limit. You know, if there's fifty- or a hundred thousand dollars in Mr. Calderbank's account -- I don't know if that's possible, but it seems like some sort of limit to say, okay, here, you can hire your new attorney now, you should be generating your income at some point and not using my client's money to fund your defense.

THE COURT: Let me ask you, Mr. Zamani, how much money approximately is available from your attorney if I were to allow your attorney to return it to you?

MR. ZAMANIZADEH: Your Honor, it's \$5,000 retainer, and I would appreciate if your court -- Your Honor issue an order to Mr. Calderbank to return that money to me since he hasn't really done anything for me.

THE COURT: I don't think I have jurisdiction over Mr. Calderbank on that.

But I will say that as part of my preliminary injunction order, that Mr. Calderbank, if he holds a retainer, that retainer may be returned to the defendant without being subject to the preliminary injunction up to a limit of \$5,000.

And since you tell me that's what he has, that should be enough.

All right. And as I said, once you get a new attorney, if you want me to -- if your attorney and you want me to reconsider any portion of this preliminary injunction, you have leave to ask and I will consider it on the merits.

More importantly, though, if you want to get to a trial sooner rather than later, have you and your attorney contact my courtroom deputy and we'll get you a trial date.

If you decide you want to do this representing yourself, speak with Mr. Richardson, let my courtroom deputy know, and we'll get you a trial date and you can represent yourself.

MR. ZAMANIZADEH: If I may ask.

THE COURT: You may.

MR. ZAMANIZADEH: Your Honor, is it possible to have Adult Care -- a search -- Adult Care Search -- Care Option, the account which has \$5,000, to be accessible for the attorney's retainer in case Mr. Calderbank tries to hold off and tries to -- which I asked repeatedly in e-mails that I need that and he keeps telling me that, you know, he wants to do an accounting and so forth and so -- I have all the e-mails, Your Honor, here.

THE COURT: I don't want to take any current money that is frozen on these accounts and unfreeze them, at least not without hearing from your attorney. I think that if your attorney is willing to give you back the retainer, if his only

concern is that it may be subject to this preliminary injunction, we'll make it clear that it is not. If he's not willing to give you back your retainer, call the Oregon State Bar. They may be able to be of assistance to you.

But I'm not going to release -- unfreeze any of the money that's currently in these accounts at this time.

MR. ZAMANIZADEH: Am I correct to understand,

Your Honor, that any income of the company that has come in that
is not related or traceable back to Mr. -- to plaintiff is not
subject to the TRO?

THE COURT: Well, I would say any new income that you earn that is not originating from or traceable to the plaintiff is not subject to the TRO provided that they don't come in to the 6923 account, the 2074 account, or the 3236 account. Those are frozen.

So if you're going to be getting new money in, which will obviously not be coming from the plaintiff, they should come into a different account.

MR. ZAMANIZADEH: Okay.

THE COURT: All right. Do let me know as soon as you get an attorney.

MR. ZAMANIZADEH: Yes.

THE COURT: Do let me know as soon as you want to schedule a trial -- I don't think this will be a particularly long trial -- and I will do my best to get it timely scheduled

```
so as to not cause further delay or undue expense to either
 1
 2
    side.
 3
               MR. ZAMANIZADEH: Thank you very much, Your Honor.
               THE COURT: Thank you, all.
 4
 5
               MR. RICHARDSON: Thank you.
               MR. ZAMANIZADEH: Appreciate it. Thank you.
 6
 7
          (The proceedings concluded at 3:47 p.m.)
 8
 9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
```

CERTIFICATE

I certify, by signing below, that the foregoing is a true and correct transcript of the record, taken by stenographic means, of the proceedings in the above-titled cause. A transcript without an original signature, conformed signature, or digitally signed signature is not certified.

DATED this 20th day of February, 2018.

RYAN WHITE

Registered Merit Reporter Certified Realtime Reporter Expires 9/30/2019 Washington CCR No. 3220 Expires 10/25/2018 Oregon CSR No. 10-0419 Expires 12/31/2020